



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,838	09/28/2001	Magnus N. Nilsson	TPP 31424	3731
7590	12/07/2006		EXAMINER	
STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P. Suite 850 1615 L Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036			HUSON, MONICA ANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1732	

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/964,838	NILSSON ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Monica A. Huson	1732

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 27,32-34,36,37,40,43,44,52,54 and 57-59.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: although applicant contends that the prior art of record does not suggest the instant invention, the examiner maintains her rejections.

With respect to claim 27, applicant contends that Correll does not teach a multi-stepped process, nor does he include partial curing by applying a UV beam. This is not persuasive, as applying a portion of a layer, curing the portion, and applying and curing a second portion at Column 8, lines 60-63. Also see Column 6, lines 66-67 and Column 7, lines 1-2 for UV curing teachings.

With respect to claim 32, applicant contends that Schmoock does not show the instant invention because it would not be obvious to use his rollers to impart a glazed surface texture to the article. Applicant further argues that a glazed surface is more than simply smooth. It is being interpreted that the term "glazed" can be broadly interpreted to include items that are smooth. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive as there is no evidence that Schmoock's rollers would not be able to provide any desired surface texture, including one that is glazed (i.e. smooth).

With respect to claim 59, applicant contends that the combination of references do not suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, there is no motivation to combine MacQueen and Scher to show use of an acrylic lacquer. This is not persuasive because MacQueen clearly discusses that choices relative to the lacquer, depending on the desired surface texture. Further, applicant contends there is no motivation to combine MacQueen's particle board with Scher's process. This is not persuasive because Scher's process is drawn to making items which would benefit from sturdy core construction (e.g. counters, tables), and it is expected that a particle board substrate would be embossed or appropriately shaped using the process of Scher similarly to the substrate specifically identified in Scher.

Monica A Huson
December 5, 2006

CHRISTINA JOHNSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

12/5/06